

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 345]

YEAS—238

Allard	Gallegly	Myrick
Archer	Ganske	Nethercutt
Army	Gekas	Neumann
Bachus	Geren	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Nussle
Ballenger	Gilman	Oxley
Barr	Gingrich	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Parker
Bartlett	Goodling	Paxon
Barton	Goss	Petri
Bass	Graham	Pombo
Bateman	Greenwood	Porter
Bereuter	Gunderson	Portman
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Pryce
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Bliley	Hancock	Quinn
Blute	Hansen	Radanovich
Boehlert	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bonilla	Hayworth	Riggs
Bono	Hefley	Roberts
Brownback	Heineman	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hobson	Roth
Burr	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burton	Hoke	Royce
Buyer	Horn	Salmon
Callahan	Hostettler	Sanford
Calvert	Houghton	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Castle	Hyde	Schiff
Chabot	Inglis	Seastrand
Chambliss	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chrysler	Jones	Shays
Clinger	Kasich	Shuster
Coble	Kelly	Skeen
Coburn	Kim	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Condit	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Knollenberg	Solomon
Cox	Kolbe	Souder
Crane	LaHood	Spence
Crapo	Largent	Stearns
Cremeans	Latham	Stockman
Cubin	LaTourette	Stump
Cunningham	Laughlin	Talent
Davis	Lazio	Tate
Deal	Leach	Tauzin
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thomas
Doolittle	Linder	Thornberry
Dornan	Livingston	Tiahrt
Dreier	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Duncan	Longley	Upton
Dunn	Lucas	Vucanovich
Ehlers	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Ehrlich	Martini	Walker
Emerson	McCollum	Walsh
English	McCrery	Wamp
Ensign	McDade	Watts (OK)
Everett	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McInnis	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	McIntosh	Weller
Fields (TX)	McKeon	White
Foley	Metcalf	Whitfield
Forbes	Meyers	Wicker
Fowler	Mica	Wolf
Fox	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Young (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Montgomery	Zeliff
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	Zimmer
Frisa	Morella	
Funderburk	Myers	

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brown (FL)
Ackerman	Bevill	Brown (OH)
Andrews	Bishop	Bryant (TX)
Baesler	Bonior	Cardin
Baldacci	Borski	Chapman
Barcia	Boucher	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Brewster	Clayton
Becerra	Browder	Clement
Beilenson	Brown (CA)	Clyburn

Coleman	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Poshard
Conyers	Kanjorski	Rahall
Costello	Kaptur	Rangel
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Reed
Cramer	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
Danner	Kennelly	Richardson
de la Garza	Kildee	Rivers
DeFazio	Klink	Roemer
DeLauro	LaFalce	Rose
Dellums	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Levin	Rush
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Dingell	Lincoln	Sanders
Dixon	Lipinski	Sawyer
Doggett	Lofgren	Schroeder
Dooley	Lowe	Schumer
Doyle	Luther	Scott
Durbin	Maloney	Serrano
Edwards	Manton	Sisisky
Engel	Markey	Skaggs
Eshoo	Martinez	Skelton
Evans	Mascara	Slaughter
Farr	Matsui	Spratt
Fattah	McCarthy	Stark
Fazio	McDermott	Stenholm
Fields (LA)	McHale	Stokes
Filner	McKinney	Studds
Flake	Meehan	Stupak
Flanagan	Meek	Tanner
Foglietta	Menendez	Tejeda
Ford	Mfume	Thompson
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Thornton
Frost	Mineta	Thurman
Furse	Minge	Torres
Gedjenson	Mink	Torricelli
Gephardt	Moakley	Towns
Gibbons	Mollohan	Tucker
Gonzalez	Moran	Velazquez
Gordon	Murtha	Vento
Green	Nadler	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Neal	Volkmer
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Ward
Hamilton	Obey	Waters
Harman	Olver	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Ortiz	Waxman
Hayes	Orton	Williams
Hefner	Owens	Wilson
Hilliard	Pallone	Wise
Hinchey	Pastor	Woolsey
Holden	Payne (NJ)	Wyden
Hoyer	Payne (VA)	Wynn
Jackson-Lee	Pelosi	Yates
Jacobs	Peterson (FL)	
Jefferson	Peterson (MN)	
Johnson (SD)	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—4

Berman	Klecza
Collins (IL)	McNulty

□ 1609

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 345 on House Concurrent Resolution 67 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1995, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations have until midnight, Friday, May 19, 1995, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly re-

duce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted no on rollcall vote No. 337, final passage of H.R. 961, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. Unfortunately, due to a technical difficulty, my vote was not recorded.

I ask that the RECORD be clear that I voted on opposition to final passage of H.R. 961.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], the former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1158, a measure providing emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance and rescissions for fiscal year 1995. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

In particular, I would note that the conference report violates clause 3, rule XXVIII, relating to scope, because appropriations related to the terrorist

bombing in Oklahoma City were added to the bill in conference, and I know everyone is very supportive of that effort.

□ 1615

The debates on this floor are getting somewhat predictable. Fortunately, the American people are getting one message that is coming through loudly and clearly.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership, including President Clinton right at the top, are unquestionably, unwaveringly, and unalterably addicted to big government. We just heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talk about the fact that we are for the first time in years turning the corner on that.

There are a number of important emergency supplemental appropriations in this bill. However, I would especially call attention to the \$6.7 billion in supplemental funding for disaster relief in 40 States; not just California, 40 States are involved.

I can assure the Members, Mr. Speaker, that in Los Angeles, in Los Angeles, where the impact of the Northridge earthquake is still felt, these funds are more critical than the rescissions included in the funding package.

The budget debate in this House boils down to whether politicians can muster the courage and conviction to stop passing trillions of dollars of economy-choking debt to our Nation's children. This is one of the most important political debates in our history. It will impact the future of every working family in this country. This emergency supplemental is a miniature version of the budget debate that we just went through.

The new majority in Congress has changed the way Washington does business. Rather than simply tossing new spending onto the mountainous Federal debt, as has been done in the past, we propose to pay for it. Is that so incredibly radical, Mr. Speaker?

The Committee on Appropriations went back and reevaluated nearly every item in the fiscal year 1995 spending program. They tried to find what I call smart cuts. They used the following criteria: No. 1, spending that was not authorized; No. 2, duplicative Federal programs; No. 3, programs that receive large funding increases in fiscal year 1995; No. 4, programs with unspent funds piling up from year to year; No. 5, programs that exceeded the level in the Clinton budget; finally, programs that are wasteful and do not work.

Those are the criteria that they used in looking at these items. Only among big-government liberals in Washington are these considered radical criteria. The Committee on Appropriations took another radical step. They proposed to cut as much unnecessary spending as possible, not just enough to balance out the new spending. Only inside the Beltway here in Washington would people advocate only looking for enough wasteful spending to balance the amount of new spending, but the Com-

mittee on Appropriations very responsibly went further. We proposed to get this Government on the path to a balanced budget, the one that was just called for in the resolution passed.

That, of course, gets us back to the balanced budget question. We are starting to see a clear trail here, Mr. Speaker, on the balanced budget amendment, despite strong bipartisan support, the President opposed it, and it came up short. However, he sure had the rhetoric down extraordinarily well, as many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have in this House. He and his friends supported a balanced budget, not just that they supported the amendment. They said they wanted specifics.

Then the Republicans came up with specific budget plans to balance the budget. Again, the big-government liberals, led by the President, ran for cover. Again there were excuses. We heard a lot of that here today when the House made history and passed this budget resolution that will put us on this glide path towards a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President's staff indicates, and the President himself has indicated, that this emergency supplemental appropriations and rescission bill will be vetoed. We are the ones who responded to his request, and he was not at the table, and yet the call is that he is going to be vetoing it. Should we be surprised?

On the one hand it is hard to believe that the President is going to veto the bill that provides relief to American families that have already suffered at the hands of earthquakes, fires, flood, and terrorism. However, look at it from the perspective of big-government's great protector. Every special interest that lives off the bloated Federal Government is frightened. They all think that they are next. The President and his very liberal allies in Congress are their great protectors. The great protectors' advisers have probably told him that if he does not oppose these cuts, special interests all over the country are likely to think that maybe the President will agree with Congress tomorrow or next week or later this year, that their special program is not absolutely critical to this Nation's future. Better to make it clear to those who live off the Federal Government that he is here for them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good conference report. It makes history. Two months ago when a bill came to the floor providing funding for these priorities, and reducing spending to pay for it, people said the spending cuts would die in the other body. Apparently they misread things. They passed by a 99 to 0 vote. Now we have these veto threats. They could be wrong, too. If not, let the President make the case that in a \$1.5 trillion budget, a 1-percent spending cut is too much.

By the way, explain why those cuts are more important than this extraordinarily important disaster relief. Mr.

Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair rule, this extraordinarily balanced conference report, which the American people are behind.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill really cuts things we should keep, and keeps things that we should cut. Even though, and I want the Members to listen closely, even though it is not as bad as the House bill, and in that we are all thankful, we are still left holding a big pile of favors for the well off at the expense of everyone else. The worst part is that \$50 billion of these cuts are not even going to deficit reduction. They are going to provide a tax break for some 1 million people, 1 million of the richest Americans in the land. Those are figures from the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like yesterday I was standing here complaining about tax cuts for the rich at the expense of Medicare recipients. Now I am standing here complaining about tax cuts for the rich at the expense of education and housing. My Republican friends say they have to cut these programs to balance the budget, but President Clinton has shown us that it is possible to cut spending, and not cut the legs from under working families. President Clinton's bill cuts \$110 million more than the Republican bill, but it does it without socking it to the middle class.

The President's rescissions bill proves if you give up the idea of tax breaks for the very rich, then we can afford a lot of very good programs that benefit the rest of the people, programs for education and training, programs for crime prevention, programs for housing, programs for veterans, and the list just goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican rescissions package is a big, fat boon for expatriated billionaires, and a serious cut for working American families. Republicans have broken their promise not to cut Medicare, and they are breaking their promise to help working families. While we are on the subject of broken promises, Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends had promised not to waive the 3-day layover, and they have gone ahead and done that, too.

Therefor, Mr. Speaker, we are getting used to this. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule. This bill, like the Republican budget, hurts the people who need help and helps the people who really do not need help. We do not have to gut education and crime programs to pay for tax breaks for the very, very rich.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER, Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in response to the last

gentleman's statements, there are no tax breaks in here, no money is going to people for tax breaks, because the conference agreement includes the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia in the Senate. The President never got his list of rescissions to us until after the conference was closed, so there was no possible way for us to act on any of his ideas, even though we have been pleading with him for 4 months to give us his ideas on rescissions.

I do not know where the gentleman got this business about a billionaires' tax cut. This is an appropriation bill, not a Committee on Ways and Means bill. It has nothing to do with tax breaks.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, still basking in the glow of passing the first balanced budget in 26 years, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Claremont, CA, for yielding time to me. It is nice to have him down out of the gallery and here on the floor. He is doing such a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the conference report it makes in order. This is the conference report that contains funds to try to repair just some of the damage that was done by the Oklahoma City blast, and yet the President has said he will veto it? This is the conference report that contains disaster assistance for the victims of the California earthquake, and yet the President of the United States has said he will veto it? This is the conference report which contains debt relief for Jordan, which the President says he wants, and yet the President has said he will veto it?

This is the conference report, Mr. Speaker, which takes the first concrete steps toward reducing the deficit by actually cutting excessive spending out of this year's funds, and yet the President has said that he will veto it? What is going on here, Mr. Speaker? Is this the only way the President can try to prove that he is relevant to the setting of budget priorities, since he has failed to propose a budget plan which would lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002?

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, I personally invited him to put that budget before us, and we would make it in order and have a legitimate, relevant debate. There was no proposal. It is unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that all 435 of us will ever agree on every detail of any set of budget priorities, because we represent different constituencies. I come from New York. We did not have the earthquake disasters in California, but yet, we have to support legitimate legislation, and this is just that.

However, this conference report does agree to reflect the will of the House reached after, I think, 10 hours of the amendment process back when the bill

was first considered in this House. There is a little sore spot involved, because at that time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and myself, along with the help of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], successfully passed on this floor by a vote of 382 to 23 an amendment and that is overwhelming, 382 to 23 restoring funding for veterans medical care and veterans health care facilities, with the cost offset by reductions in AmeriCorps, and leaving the veterans' programs with zero cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that in a compromise the conferees have restored AmeriCorps, the President's pet project, to where it was before this House acted, and put back in the cuts in veterans' programs totaling \$81 million. I know conferees fought very hard against that, and I appreciate that, but as far as I am concerned, this conference agreement has already gone too far to protect the President's pet project, that thing called AmeriCorps.

I am going to vote for this conference report, but if the President does veto the compromise agreement, I strongly hope and urge that our conferees or that this House will stick to the overwhelming position that this House took when the bill first left the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] have very difficult jobs, and they have done them so well. I just hope that this body, after the vote on the balanced budget resolution today, is now going to have the guts that the gentleman from Louisiana has and that the other members of the Committee on Appropriations are going to have in putting specific cuts out here on the floor for debate. I am going to support every one of them. That is a promise. They deserve our support, and they deserve our commendations.

If the President is smart, he will sign this legislation, Mr. Speaker. There is one other point I would like to make. That has to do with the rhetoric that has been used with regard to the conference agreement on the budget debate. Repeatedly we Republicans have been accused of making cuts that are mean-spirited as we attempt to balance the budget, the most important issue facing this entire Nation over the next 5 years. What is really mean-spirited and what is greedy is to keep borrowing money and doubling the bills on future generations so liberal Democrats can make themselves feel self-righteous today.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, if they want to feel self-righteous, they should have the courage to step up here and offer balanced budget solutions of their own rather than just criticize those that we have offered.

I urge support for this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this conference report. I do so not because I oppose cutting spending, but because the conference report does not include the Brewster-Minge lockbox amendment which applied all of the savings from the bill to deficit reduction.

The Brewster-Minge amendment would have reduced the discretionary spending caps to reflect the savings in each of the next 5 years from the spending cuts in the package, thereby applying the savings to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge amendment would have reduced the spending limits by \$66.2 billion over 5 years. Incidentally, I would point out that the Brewster-Minge amendment uses the same approach to reducing the discretionary caps that was in the Penny-Kasich amendment offered by our former colleague Tim Penny and the current chairman of the Budget Committee JOHN KASICH in the 103d Congress.

The House overwhelmingly passed the Brewster-Minge amendment when the rescission bill was considered by the House, but the House leadership almost immediately began to back away from its support of the amendment. The other body passed a significantly weaker version of the lockbox that only applied the savings from the first year to deficit reduction instead of reducing the caps to lock in the savings for all 5 years to deficit reduction. Unfortunately, the conference chose to accept the weaker version of lockbox that only applies \$15.5 billion in savings to deficit reduction.

The House conferees would have us believe that they had to drop the Brewster amendment because the other body would not accept it. However, I would point out that PETE DOMENICI, the chairman of the Budget Committee and a very influential member of the other body on budget issues in the other body endorsed the approach in the Brewster-Minge amendment during the debate on this bill on March 29. He said, and I quote, "We could take this little \$6 billion savings and make it recur each year, and we would be over \$30 billion * * * We will have to do more than that."

I have heard some members argue that the savings from the lockbox amendment are irrelevant because we will reduce the spending limits much more in the reconciliation bill later in the year. If that is true, then I do not understand the objection to making those reductions now by accepting the Brewster-Minge amendment. Should we not lock in the savings now just in case we do not enact lower spending limits later in the year for whatever reason?

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat this bill and send it back to conference so

that we can keep the strongest possible lockbox in the bill. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Everett, PA [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. To set the record straight, yesterday the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Leon Panetta, stated that the President was disappointed that the conferees failed to rescind and included \$130 million for nine separate highway projects in one congressional district, in my congressional district.

The facts are that they had their facts all wrong. The truth is, and I know it is difficult sometimes for them in this administration to stick to the truth, but the truth is that the Senate attempted to rescind \$141 million in 72 projects. This gentleman had only 2 projects in the 72 with a total value of less than \$6 million.

I regret deeply that this administration has decided to attempt to politicize what historically has been a bipartisan issue, transportation, and just this afternoon compounded their distortion with the double talk of saying what they really were talking about were 10 projects in Pennsylvania that go all the way back to the 1980's.

These projects that they talked about this afternoon have absolutely nothing to do with the rescission bill. This is classic double talk. I deeply regret that the administration is deciding apparently to politicize transportation.

In fact, it is ironic the projects which they seem to attack this afternoon are projects which were passed into law by a Democratically controlled House, and projects which Leon Panetta voted in favor of when he was in this House. But their crocodile tears are simply that.

The fact of the matter is the proof of their political activity is that the original House rescission bill had \$131 million in old transit funds in it. Despite the fact that the Federal Transit Administration promised us they would not act on any of these rescissions to put the money out, they violated that trust. Between the time of the original rescission bill and when it came to the floor, the Federal Transit Administration pumped out \$100 million in transit projects that were to be rescinded. Of course, these transit projects go to the big cities, largely to Democratic districts.

Mr. Speaker, they have chosen to politicize transportation. I regret that deeply, but if that is the game they want to play, we know how to play that game.

I would simply say to the Clinton administration downtown, if this is the way you want to treat transportation, we understand what you are doing. We regret it. We hope that you will rethink this partisan approach to transportation. But if you do not, then I can assure you as we move transpor-

tation legislation this year through the House, the national highway system, for example, and other transportation bills, we will have to respond in kind to the very sad approach which you seem to be taking to what historically has been a bipartisan issue, and, that is, transportation for the good of our country.

Wonderful Jim Howard, Democratic chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure when he was here, used to say there are no Republican or Democratic bridges or highways; there are American bridges and highways. That is the way we Republicans still feel.

I know many of my Democratic friends in the House here feel that way as well, but obviously the Clinton administration does not. They have chosen to politicize this issue. They have chosen to break trust with the House by pushing through \$100 million in transit projects that were to be rescinded. I guess we are going to have to recognize it is a new and sad day.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to correct the impression left by the last speaker. The fact is, the last speaker arrives at his number by carefully excluding certain activities that were undertaken by the administration. The fact is, the administration's proposal would have allowed cancellation of projects in ISTEA, which is the authorizing highway legislation, as well as allowing the cancellation of appropriated items.

If we look at all of the projects that the administration was talking about being allowed to cancel, including those in the authorizing legislation, there are 9 projects in the gentleman's district and there are 30 in the gentleman's State. The gentleman is correct that if we look only at what the Senate rescinded, or tried to rescind, that he only has 2 projects, but if we look at the totality of the projects the administration wanted to cancel in both the authorization and appropriation bill, then the administration's numbers are correct.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida [Mr. GOSS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from greater downtown San Dimas, CA [Mr. DREIER], the chairman of another important subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, for allowing me such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just had a very strong historic vote in this Chamber. It really was remarkable to be here and

feel the sense of what is happening here. We sent a signal.

Sadly enough, it is a little too late in fiscal year 1995 to balance our budget this year. But it is certainly not too late to cut our unnecessary spending in fiscal year 1995, and we have a chance to do that right now.

Any day is a good day to save taxpayers' dollars. If you doubt it, just ask the taxpayer. Every day that we spend taxpayers' dollars is a good day to spend them wisely. If you doubt it, ask a taxpayer.

This legislation starts us toward balancing the budget, which we just had a strong, convincing vote on. It does it in a big way. We are talking about billions of dollars.

Why would we delay that? The answer is we would not. Why is the President talking of delaying that by vetoing our effort to stop bad spending now?

Let's agree that there may be some disagreement with the President about what actually constitutes bad spending, but then let's look at the next thing. There could be no disagreement about providing prompt and needed relief to Americans, American citizens, victims of tragedies, and this conference report provides relief to such Americans.

This conference report also saves money. This conference report is a responsible first step toward getting our spending under control. Why do we not pass it now? Why would we think that the President would even veto such a good piece of legislation?

Why, in fact, did we hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, that there is concern about the 3-day layover waiver so that we could get to this legislation now and pass it and provide this relief?

The waivers that we have provided for in the rule, and this is a very good rule for this type of legislation, show that the only things that are in this resolution are basically a provision to take care of the victims of Oklahoma, which I think everybody would agree is important, and recognition for Korean War veterans, which I think also everybody would agree is important. There is nothing else new from the original report. Consequently, there is no reason.

Members are aware of what is going on here. I do not think there is any justification at all for not getting on immediately with this and passing this legislation and getting it down to the White House. I sincerely hope the President of the United States will agree there is no reason for delay.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think you will notice that I have a pretty worn and torn and tattered example of what will happen to not just the State of Texas but to many States

around the Nation. I carry this because these are not the numbers of the 18th Congressional District in Texas. These are the numbers of \$1.1 billion that will impact the citizens of the State of Texas.

Even as we begin to deliberate on the rescissions bill, I thought there was hope, as the process proceeded and we went forward to the Senate and then the conference committee, in order to be able to emphasize what all of us are concerned about, and that is helping to reduce the deficit.

Unfortunately, when the bill returns we find that if you take it, you will lose it. What we will lost in Texas is \$1.1 billion, only an example of what the rest of the country will lose as well.

□ 1645

Let me respond to the concern for those citizens who tragically have experienced a very serious loss. I have spoken to the administration and there is a response to those in Oklahoma City and California, the dollars are there for that kind of need. But what we do not have the dollars for, and what we are spending the dollars for, is a tax cut for those making over \$200,000, and taking away money in this rescissions package from assisted housing that is needed all over the Nation for those who would need to have section 8 rental assistance. Those are working families that need those dollars, and I thought we were beginning to be able to strike a very good compromise on summer youth employment. That is what the young people have asked for in my district. They need to work. Oh, yes, they can work this summer, but folks, they will not be able to work next summer. And some of these people work to survive, to be able to go to school and in order to pay for clothes in order to get an education.

Education, the school-to-work program that the Houston Community College came to me and said was one of the best programs in this Nation, is now being cut drastically, \$12.5 million. Education in the Goals 200 Program, and those communities, rural, towns, and cities that are just beginning to rebuild their infrastructure and transportation system, well, folks, they are gone.

Those who are just getting up the stairs, trying to make a system that is more mobile, trying to comply with the Clean Air Act, transportation dollars for those communities have now been cut \$2.2 billion.

And the veterans, somebody said stop giving to the deadbeats, are veterans deadbeats? Are they the ones who have, in fact, given both their lives, some, but as well their support to this Nation? Well, Mr. Speaker, the veterans are being cut as well, \$50 million.

I thought I could support this rescission package in the spirit of cooperation, but not at the tune of \$1.1 billion for the State of Texas.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 10½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former mayor of Santa Clarita, CA, an area heavily impacted by the Northridge earthquake, the gentleman from California [Mr. McKEON].

(Mr. McKEON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I always love to be introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. He always makes you feel so good and has some flowery use of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this rule, and to decry the veto threats of the President's political advisors. There is no excuse for playing politics with working families in California who have suffered immense hardship from natural disasters.

There are times when elected officials must rise above politics and respond to a crisis. When the Northridge earthquake devastated the San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, and surrounding areas last year, I believed one of those times was at hand.

I applauded the President for going to Los Angeles and seeing the destruction first hand. He met hard-working people who bravely faced the brunt of the disaster. It was not a question of Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, it was the President responding to an emergency that rose above politics.

When the President asked Congress for \$6.7 billion in supplemental appropriations to begin to rebuild in the face of massive destruction, my Republican colleagues in the House were determined to cut other spending to pay for the cost. Now, I accept second place to nobody in the desire to reduce Federal spending and balance the budget. However, I opposed my colleagues and supported the President's request without offsets.

I argued last year that there are a few instances when providing relief rises above political fights. When a leader must make the difficult decisions, even stand against those who are usually his allies, in order to meet the needs of those who have been struck by a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, by threatening to veto the conference report that continues to provide relief to communities decimated by last year's earthquake, the President is failing that test. He is letting down the families and communities who need this assistance. Has he forgotten his visit of last year? Maybe the political advisers urging a veto weren't with the President when he walked through the communities he now threatens to ignore?

I recognize that it is difficult for this big-government President to support

spending cuts. It was very difficult for me last year to vote to add emergency relief funds to deficit. But, I made a tough choice in order to help those disaster victims who needed it most. Ultimately, the political fights over balanced budgets were played out in more appropriate places.

Mr. Speaker, the President's advisers have lost touch with disaster victims in California. Go ahead, oppose the balance budget amendment. Oppose the budget resolution. Oppose the appropriations bills later this year that will cut spending. But have the courage to accept a few cuts to enact disaster relief.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I must vote against the rule and this bill. It is an accumulation of unwise reductions in important programs. Just about every program in the Government was cut, housing, health research, transportation, clean fuel, nutrition for women and children, the elderly, every program benefiting the average person has been reduced by the Republican majority. But the amazing fact, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill does not cut the Department of Defense by one penny; a budget of \$272 billion for the Department of Defense last year, and there are no reductions at all.

I noticed in the paper this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Defense is getting ready to obtain procurement for a program of \$60 billion in new submarines. When I asked the staff who our enemy was that justifies the expenditure of \$60 billion, I was told that the Navy came in and testified well, it could be Iran, it could be North Korea, it could be India.

What kind of program is this? What kind of fairness is this when the programs that are so vital to the average person are being reduced substantially and the Department of Defense, which a great majority of the people of this country look to for having reductions, has not been cut at all? I shall vote against this program, Mr. Speaker. I think that the House should kill this bill. The President is exactly right in threatening to veto it.

Particularly destructive is the so-called Taylor amendment.

One point seven million miles of timber. Nine billion board feet. That is what the timber salvage sales amendment mandates. And this long line of timber is to be taken out of our national forests without the normal environmental protections, with no administrative review, and only limited judicial review.

If you voted for my amendment to strike the timber salvage sales provision when the rescissions bill was before the House in March, there is no reason to change your mind now about this subsidy for the timber industry. In fact, there is every reason for more of you to

join me in rejecting this ill-conceived evasion of current law and invasion of our national forests.

First, you will recall that the House version was limited to 2 years of salvage sales. The Senate version was to last only through fiscal year 1996, less than 2 years. But guess what, the timber lobbyists got their wish and the conference agreement extends all the way through fiscal year 1997. This giveaway now lasts 3 years. So, now you have an amendment that suspends all laws, yes, all laws, not just environmental laws, for a period longer than either the House or Senate version.

Proponents of the amendment will say they have removed the mandates to sell 6 billion board feet in 2 years as contained in the House version. Yes, that is accurate. But read the statement of the managers. That is where the targets are and they are more than the Forest Service says it can reasonably and responsibly do. Now, nearly 9 billion board feet is demanded, 3 billion more than the original plan. And if the Forest Service is not able to match the targets of the managers, then there are veiled threats about what will happen to the Forest Service. The report says: "The managers will carefully review the Administration's implementation of the salvage program, and, if found to be inadequate, will employ such actions as deemed necessary. Such action might include, but are not limited to, reallocation or other prioritizations to be determined by the Congress." A threat if I have ever heard one. Do not be fooled, there is still a mandate to get a specified amount of timber cut.

All administrative appeals processes are eliminated. Judicial review is severely curtailed. All balance is thrown out the window. Just get the timber out the door. Do not worry about silting streams; do not worry about environmental protection; do not worry about Forest plans; do not worry about below cost sales; do not worry about contracting procedures. Just do it, or else.

And the conference agreement goes beyond the House version by exempting the President's plan for the Pacific Northwest from all administrative review and as with salvage sales, also limits judicial review. There is no reason to do this. The President's plan has just recently received the approval of the courts. It takes time to refill the pipeline to reach the timber sales approved by the courts.

Those who were allowed to participate in the discussions leading to this final version, and I was not invited, have exceeded their scope. They have gone beyond what either House agreed to in terms of length of the program and have added more exemptions to the Senate provision on the President's Northwest Forest Plan, exemptions that were in neither bill. This timber salvage sale provision now has more exemptions than a CPA's tax return.

Yes, I care about forest health and acknowledge there must be timber salvage sales. That is not the question. The question is: Do we allow the Forest Service to harvest the salvageable timber in a responsible way or do we arbitrarily impose these capricious limits on agencies that think it is a mistake. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the administration have moved to expedite salvage sales without abandoning appropriate checks and balances. We must let the professional foresters do their job.

In the name of fiscal prudence, forest health and common sense, we should reject this fatally flawed conference agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my dear friend from South Boston how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have four speakers waiting with bated breath.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of rhetoric this afternoon about the task of balancing the budget. There is probably not a Member of this Chamber that does not in one way or the other have a commitment to balancing the budget. It is a question of how do we do it and do it fairly.

The term shared sacrifice has been used a great deal. To me shared sacrifice means that we do not balance the budget on the backs of low-income Americans, children, veterans, and the elderly. It means that we look to the broader community and ask who can contribute a fair share to this effort.

I am struck because this year I had a visit from a person who has been very active in the Republican Party in my community. He came as a businessman. And he talked to me about the summer job program for youth, not because he in any way is connected with the program; his business does not benefit one way or the other. He is a former educator. He came to me because he believes in the program and he thinks it ought to be continued. And he paid his own way, he bought his own ticket to come to Washington, DC, to talk to me about this.

To me, this speaks volumes about what this type of program does for our young people. The question is then, if we truly have shared sacrifice, how does this fit into the equation? What does it mean when we are trying to balance the budget and at the same time we strip out of the rescissions bill the provisions that would otherwise commit the savings to deficit reduction and allow them to go to tax cuts?

This speaks volumes to me about the motives of those that have brought this bill to us for final action.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that what is happening here bears no resemblance to shared sacrifice. Instead we are asking youth, elderly, low-income, and veterans, with the budget that we have debated today in this rescissions bill, to tighten their belts by two notches while many other Americans are belling up to the table for an extra dessert.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I recall very vividly that when we started the markup in our appropriations subcommit-

tees on this rescission bill the first question that was asked of the chairman of the committee was why are we making these cuts, why do we have to make billions of dollars of cuts in nutrition, education, housing, mass transit, clean air enforcement, and the list goes on and on.

The response we received was that we needed the funds to provide a tax cut. There was some embarrassment with that answer after a while and it shifted to well, we need the funds for deficit reduction.

Why then, if these funds are supposed to go to deficit reduction, did not the Republican majority accept the Brewster Minge language for the lockbox to save the money that is in this bill for deficit reduction? It is very clear, and that is that the funds that are cut from education, nutrition, transportation, housing, et cetera, are once again to fund a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans.

Earlier today we saw Members on the other side of the aisle show us beautiful pictures of their children, and they are lovely. Indeed, we are all so very proud of our children, and it is hard to understand how we can treasure our own children while at the same time we come to this floor to cut education for the children of America and they are our children, too. How can we value our children and make all of the cuts that this legislation does in funding for safe and drug-free schools, for Goals 2000, and then down the line to vocational and adult education and student financial aid. This on the same day as the budget bill cut so much funding from the student aid programs for college education. In addition to that, in addition to that, there are millions of dollars cut in funding for displaced workers' programs to assist those who have lost their jobs due to imports, plant closings, and other economic reasons.

There are many, many reasons to oppose this legislation, Mr. Speaker, but the education part of the bill and adult education and job training part of the bill and the summer youth programs part of the bill are enough reason for the President to veto the bill, and I am so pleased that he is.

As a California member of the Committee on Appropriations I want to make another point, and it is that no person in any disaster in any part of this country will be deprived of their assistance if the President vetoes this bill.

Indeed, I voted against this bill in committee and on this floor because I object to a bill that would say to the children of California you had a disaster, now in order to get assistance you are going to have to pay for it with your education and your nutrition and your housing.

□ 1700

So I think that the Clinton administration response to this legislation is appropriate.

I also want to say one more thing about the Clinton administration. They deserve a great deal of credit for the excellent response they have given to disasters that have occurred in this country. Jamie Lee Whitten deserves our gratitude and the President our commendation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman because in the last day and a half we have learned a great deal about rescissions. We have seen one giant rescission on the floor of this House as our Republican colleagues rescinded their commitment to the millions of American seniors that are counting on Medicare.

And now we get three more lessons:

No. 1, when it comes to making a choice, a choice between locking in savings from these cuts to deficit reduction and using it for a tax cut for the privileged few, the choice was easy; this House voted overwhelmingly to lock in those savings. But it was not 24 hours later than across the street the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, "Oh, it is all just a big game." And it was just a big game because all along they needed every dollar of those cuts to give out tax breaks for their friends.

Lesson No. 2: When it comes time to chop, who gets chopped first? Well, it is the middle-class families that are struggling to get up that economic ladder, to get their children educated, because the place that this rescission begins rescinding is in education and the Federal commitment to back up our local schools with education.

Lesson No. 3: Loopholes last. The Senate approved language that would be part of this rescissions bill to condemn the atrocious practice where some Americans can actually go out and burn their citizenship card and at the same time burn the taxpayer. Is that loophole provision in here? No, sir, it is nowhere to be found in this conference report.

We have heard a lot about disasters today. Well, let me tell you, as long as the priorities are to cut education first and to cut tax loopholes for the privileged last, that is a disaster.

I am glad to have an opportunity to vote against that kind of a disaster by voting against this conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM.]

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Like many of my colleagues in the coalition and some beyond in my party, I believe in many of the rescissions included in this conference report.

I am absolutely dead set, however, against taking these spending cuts and using them for a tax cut or for other spending.

We had a way to guarantee that the cuts would go to deficit reduction. The Brewster-Minge lock box sealed up \$66.2 billion over the next 5 years.

I am not only willing to make that sort of cut, I am eager to do so. But I am not going to give up Rural Health grants, AHEC money, Safe & Drug Free School money, funds for Vocational Education—and much more, just so that money can be used for tax cuts.

There has been a weakening of trust over the way the lock box in this bill was handled. An early understanding of \$66 billion in savings disintegrated into something much smaller, \$15.5 billion in this conference report.

I would love to vote for a rescission bill—but not for the sake of tax cuts. If the President vetoes this bill, I intend to support him in that veto for purposes of restoring the lock box.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to respond to the previous speaker.

All this discussion about a lock box and an agreement, the agreement was oral. There was no mention in the discussions with respect to future savings.

The past savings and current savings are in there in the Byrd amendment, which was passed in the Senate and agreed to in the conference. So that entire issue is by the boards. There is no savings going to tax cuts.

The Byrd amendment in the conference agreement makes sure that that is the case.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I wanted to make sure I heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations correctly. He said that was not an agreement; it was an oral agreement. Are we to conclude from that that an agreement, an oral agreement with the Republicans is not worth the paper it is written on?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was no paper. When I engaged in negotiations with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], there was no mention of paper. We talked about saving of past efforts and current efforts. There was never any mention of future projected savings or future offsets.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman is saying the savings in the bill will not go for deficit reduction?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am saying the Byrd amendment covers exactly word for word the agreement that was made. The gentleman fully knows that.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I do not.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that CBO has no trouble figuring out what the Brewster language meant. Because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Brewster lockbox would result in \$66.5 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years.

The deficit reduction in this conference report is \$15.48 billion. So it seems to me that the CBO, which is the neutral umpire which is supposed to keep all of us honest around here, understood what the Brewster amendment did. The Brewster amendment tried to dedicate all savings in the immediate year and out years for deficit reduction.

The conference report comes back and only dedicates \$15 billion.

Now the chairman of the committee says, "Oh, but that was the Byrd language." Let me make clear, Senator BYRD and I are in full agreement. Neither one of us wants to see these savings used to provide tax cuts for rich people. The difference is that Senator BYRD is in the other body, and the other body has a budget resolution that does not even contemplate using any of these savings for tax reduction. They contemplate using them all for deficit reduction, and so they never even dreamed that these funds would be used for a tax cut rather than for deficit reduction.

So do not try to say that the language in the conference report meets the test of the Brewster amendment. It does not.

CBO indicates the Brewster amendment would save \$66 billion. This conference report only provides \$15.48 billion for deficit reduction and makes available the rest for tax cuts.

Four hundred and four people in this institution voted not to do that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. We would not need this rule if we followed the rules of the House.

The fact of the matter is, besides being a bad bill in cutting youth employment and education programs and housing, this bill also puts our national forests up for sale. This bill, which left the House as a bad bill with the forest provision, mandates these cuts. It puts